

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/724,515	•	11/26/2003	Adam L. Cohen	P-US024-A-MF	1836
32107	7590	08/09/2006		EXAMINER	
MICROFABRICA INC.				CULBERT, ROBERTS P	
ATT: DENNIS R. SMALLEY 7911 HASKELL AVENUE VAN NUYS, CA 91406				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				1763	
				DATE MAILED: 08/09/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application/Control Number: 10/724,515

**Art Unit: 1763** 

### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of Species A in the reply filed on 5/24/06 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Further, as pointed out by applicant, since it is possible to write dependant claims based on claim 1 that yield the scopes of claims 14 and 17, claim 1 must be considered generic.

Therefore, none of the claims have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species.

# **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-23 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousnesstype double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-11 of copending Application No. 2005/0205430. Application/Control Number: 10/724,515

Art Unit: 1763

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. Claim 1 of the conflicting application recites bringing the contact mask and substrate together in a controlled manner using relative speed prior to contact that is less than is used when the surfaces are further apart. Claim 1 of the instant application similarly recites bringing the contact mask and substrate together in a controlled manner at only selected locations, and providing continued relative movement to bring all of the relevant mating surfaces into contact. The mask contacting process recited in Claim 1 of the conflicting application anticipates the mask contacting process the instant application since the adjustment in relative speed at a location reads on a controlled process at selected locations as broadly claimed by applicant. Further, Claims 3 and 4 of the conflicting application are identical to claims 9 and 10 of the instant application.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Roberts Culbert whose telephone number is (571) 272-1433. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on (571) 272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/724,515

Art Unit: 1763

Page 4

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

100

R. Culbert Examiner Art Unit 1763